

Application/Control Number: 09/699,495  
Art Unit: 2645

Atty. Docket No. 112233-CON-2

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. Claims 4-6, 8, 14, 31 - 33, 35 and 41 are cancelled and claims 1, 27, 28 and 54 are amended.

#### **Priority**

Applicants have amended the first paragraph of the application to remove the priority claim. Therefore, Applicants request a withdrawal of the objection over the priority claim.

#### **Specification**

Applicants traverse the Examiner's objection to the incorporation by reference of the Gorin 95 and the Gorin 94A articles. The Examiner appears to object because it is "not known whether the references are a publication, article, or textbook to be located." These are articles that are published as part of conference proceedings as is clear from the citations in the specification. Applicants include with this response the Gorin 95 article thus making its contents available in the record. Applicants note that the citation to the conference proceedings for the Gorin 94A article is also provided thus making it publicly available. Furthermore, Applicants note that the same incorporation by reference of the same articles is found in the issued patent 5,675,606, column 4, without objection. Accordingly, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph arguing that there is not enough support in the specification for the generation of meaningful phrases from verbal and non-verbal speech. Applicants have amended the claims to recite verbal input and non-verbal input. Applicant notes that this amendment is similar to the amendment filed April 4, 2005 in a corresponding patent application No. 09/699,494.

Application/Control Number: 09/699,495  
Art Unit: 2645

Atty. Docket No. 112233-CON-2

With the amendment to the claims, Applicants note that claims 4 - 6, 8, 14, 31 - 33, 35 and 41 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Applicant notes that the summary of the invention, page 2, line 20, states that “[t]he system may include a meaningful phrase generator that generates a plurality of meaningful phrases from a set of verbal and non-verbal speech.” Accordingly, although Applicant has amended the claims to recite “input”, Applicants note that the specification does describe the generation of meaning phrases from verbal and non-verbal input. The disclosure on pages 5 and 6, including the incorporation of the articles discussed above, provide further details regarding the use of verbal and non-verbal input.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that there is sufficient support in the specification regarding the generation of meaningful phrases from verbal input and non-verbal input. Applicants request a withdrawal of this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, 27, 28, 31, 33 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 6, 27, 28, 31, 33 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph due to the phrase “non-verbal speech”. Applicants have cancelled claims 4, 6, 31, 33 and amended claims 1, 27, 28 and 54 to recite “non-verbal input.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn. Claims 1, 27, 28 and 54 each conform to Section 112.

**Rejection of Claims 1-55 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorin et al. in view of Blattner et al. “Multimedia Interface Design”, ACM Press, New York, New York, 1992 (“Blattner et al.”). Claims 4 - 6, 8, 14, 31 - 33, 35 and 41 are cancelled thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Application/Control Number: 09/699,495  
Art Unit: 2645

Atty. Docket No. 112233-CON-2

Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining claims are patentable. Applicants submit that regarding independent claims 1 and 28, that the Gorin et al. article fails to teach means for generating a plurality of meaningful phrases from verbal input and non-verbal input. Each of the meaningful phrases is generated based on one of a predetermine set of task objectives. Applicants note that the Examiner recites the claim as requiring means for “determining”. Applicants note that there is a difference between “determining” a plurality of meaningful phrases and “generating” a plurality of meaningful phrases. Gorin et al. fail to disclose a system that generates a plurality of meaningful phrases. The Multi-layer Network that maps language to semantic actions shown in FIG. 2 on page 138 of the Gorin et al. paper includes word detectors that detect input words from the sentence input, and then a group of the word detectors sends the detected words to the phrase detectors. This is exclusively a detection system. The Examiner asserts that col. 1, page 138, paragraphs 2 and 3 teach generating a plurality of meaningful phrases. (The Examiner actually fails to assert this but instead asserts that Gorin et al. teach *determining* a plurality of meaningful phrases). However, the Multi-layered Network shown in Gorin et al. simply fails to disclose any component that *generates* a plurality of meaningful phrases from verbal and non-verbal user input.

Because of the above analysis, the Examiner is incorrect in equating the phrase detector of FIG. 2 of Gorin et al. with the recognizer in the claims that recognizes one of the generated meaningful phrases. The phrase detector receives its input in Gorin et al. from the word “detectors”. These are merely word detection devices, not phrase generating devices. Therefore, this limitation is also not taught in Gorin et al.

Inasmuch as the primary reference fails to teach several limitations in the independent claims, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 28 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Each pending claim that depends from either claim 1 or claim 28 is therefore patentable as well inasmuch as the parent claim is patentable.

Application/Control Number: 09/699,495  
Art Unit: 2645

Atty. Docket No. 112233-CON-2

### CONCLUSION

Having addressed the rejection of claims 1-55, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 7, 2005

by: Thomas M. Isaacson/

Correspondence Address:

Samuel H. Dworetsky  
AT&T Corp.  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,166  
Phone: 410-414-3056  
Fax No.: 410-510-1433